UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/551,124	09/26/2005	Toru Inoue	1089.45436X00	4032
20457 7590 10/26/2010 ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP 1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET			EXAMINER	
			CHANG, VICTOR S	
SUITE 1800 ARLINGTON, VA 22209-3873			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1788	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/26/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/551,124	INOUE ET AL.
zammor muatou morvion cummary	Examiner	Art Unit
	VICTOR S. CHANG	1788
All Participants:	Status of Application: Fina	<u>al</u>
(1) <u>VICTOR S. CHANG</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Alan Schiavelli</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>12 October 2010</u>	Time: <u>10AM</u>	
Type of Interview:	nt's representative)	
Part I. Rejection(s) discussed: Final rejection of record		
Claims discussed:		
Prior art documents discussed: N/A		
Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	B DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary 	e examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
Winter C. Charry		
/Victor S Chang/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1788 (A	pplicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)



Application No. 10/551,124

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner proposes to amend the limitations in claim 1 regrading the thickness features of sound absorption layer, so as to clarify the scope of the claimed invention. Specifically, the examiner proposes to clarify the unevenness of the sound absorption layer. However, attorney declined the examiner's proposal..